Remarks

The following is a response to Office Action dated April 2, 2007. Applicants thank the examiner for noting the wrong pages and numbers. Per the above amendment, the specification has been corrected with the appropriate paragraphs.

As for the grammatical errors noted, the applicants would like to point out that "exemplar" is in fact the correct spelling, while "examplar" that the examiner noted is wrong. As for "sans", please note that this is a correct spelling and means "without". The same is true with respect to "import" as it is used as a noun and is the equivalent of "importance".

Claims 18-24 and 53-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Anderson (US 5,586,781); and claims 18-26 and 53-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogerson (US 3,765,498) in view of Anderson.

Per the above amendment, independent claims 18 and 53 each have been amended. As set forth in claim 18, the at issue snowmobile includes a processor and at least one sensor that is provided in the snowmobile which is positioned relative to the frame and the slide tracks in order to monitor the position of the body relative to a baseline at the frame so that monitor signals may be provided from the sensor to the processor for display on a gauge of the snowmobile. The support for this feature is provided in the first full paragraph on page 10. The method of claim 53 likewise has been amended to set forth the steps of monitoring of the position of the body relative to a baseline of the frame, the providing of the monitored signals to a processor, and the displaying of the monitor signal to at least one gauge on the snowmobile. Furthermore, the valve means are actuated based on the monitored signals.

Anderson describes a hydro-pneumatic suspension system that is responsive to energy from ground impacts to the ground engaging parts of the vehicle, and the utilization of such impacts to adjust the height of the chasse relative to the ground engaging parts

(column 2, lines 14-18). To that end, Anderson uses a hydro-pneumatic strut that is shown in Figs. 1 and 2, along with the valves and an auxiliary gas cylinder 14. Anderson particularly utilizes the two shut-off valves 15 and 16 to either increase or reduce the height of the chasse relative to the ground. To increase the ride height of the vehicle, valve 15 is opened and valve 16 closed. To reduce the ride height, valve 15 is closed and valve 16 is opened. In each instances, given that there are the non-return valves 18 and 17, each time that there is a retraction/extension of the strut, the gas in gas chamber 7 is either increased by the feeding thereto from the gas in auxiliary gas cylinder 14 (to increase the ride height), or decreased as when the gas from gas chamber 7 is fed to auxiliary gas cylinder 14 (to reduce the height). The non-return valves 18 and 17 prevent the gas from traversing between auxiliary gas cylinder 14 and gas chamber 7. Thus, every time there is an increase in gas volume in gas chamber 7, it stays increased; and conversely every time there is a decrease of the gas volume in gas chamber 7, the volume of gas in gas chamber 7 stays decreased. Thus, the way in which the hydro-pneumatic strut of Anderson is controlled is by means of the impacts it receives from the ground. Anderson also discloses the use of a control box 20. However, it receives commands based on information input thereto such as the actual ride height, payload, and/or predetermined ride requirements (column 3, lines 36-41).

In contrast, for the instant invention, there is a constant feedback insofar as there is a sensor provided at the snowmobile that is positioned relative to the frame and the slide tracks, so that the position of the body relative to a baseline of the frame is determined in realtime and fed back to the processor for either display or controlling the valve to provide optimal riding comfort for the rider.

It should be noted that there is another sensor provided in the snowmobile to sense the weight of the rider, so that the fluid actuated device that provides the cushioned ride for the rider may be automatically adjusted, per set forth in claim 24. The pressure of the ski and also the types of movements the ski is subjected to may also be sensed and

provided by a feedback circuit to the processor for controlling the ski, as set forth in new claim 58.

There is no sensor disclosed in Anderson. Nor is there any feedback disclosed in Anderson for controlling the actuation of the hydro-pneumatic strut. Indeed, Anderson emphasizes that the adjustment of the hydro-pneumatic strut is based on the ground impacts it senses, until there is a equalized pressure between the gas in gas chamber 7 and the auxiliary gas cylinder 14 (column 4, lines 25-33 and lines 43-46).

Rogerson discloses a snowmobile that has skis with suspensions. There is nothing in Rogerson that suggests that its skis include a feedback circuit, as now required in claims 55 and 58.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that the instant invention is patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Accordingly, the examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application and pass the same to issue at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

Louis Woo, RN 31,730
Law Offices of Louis Woo
717 North Fayette Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 299-4090

Date: July 2, 2007